

New York Tribune.

First to Last—the Truth: News-Editorials—Advertisements.

SUNDAY, MAY 2, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, 150 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (Incorporated in New York.)

Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Subscription	Rate
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	\$12.00
Daily & Sunday, 6 months	\$6.00
Daily & Sunday, 3 months	\$3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 month	\$1.00
Sunday only, 1 year	\$4.00
Sunday only, 6 months	\$2.00
Sunday only, 3 months	\$1.00
Sunday only, 1 month	.50

Foreign Rates: Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$20.00; 6 months, \$12.00; 3 months, \$7.00; 1 month, \$2.50. Sunday only, 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$5.00; 3 months, \$3.00; 1 month, \$1.00.

Entered as Second Class Matter, May 1, 1879, at New York, N. Y., under Post Office No. 150, Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

The Railroad Wage Award.

The illogicality of our system of railroad regulation is demonstrated once more in the arbitration award in the Western railroads case. The demands of the engineers, firemen and engine caretakers for better working conditions and higher pay were submitted to a board organized under the terms of the Federal conciliation law. Two members of the board represented the railroads, two the men and two the Federal Board of Mediation and Conciliation. The award, from which the representatives of the men sharply dissented, allowed a moderate increase in wages and made a number of concessions as to the other points of complaint.

The associations of railway employees say that they have gained nothing substantial. Circuit Judge Jeter C. Pritchard, the chairman of the board, admits that on the face of the case the men were entitled to more than they got, and they would undoubtedly have received more had the arbitration been one between men and employers in an industry not subject to unintelligent governmental regulation. But how could any arbitration commission, taking into consideration the restrictions put on the earning power of the railroads, equitably ask the common carriers to raise wages so long as another agency of the Federal government—the Interstate Commerce Commission—is notoriously reluctant to allow them to increase their earnings?

Here is the great vice of the present system of Federal control. Congress passes laws which practically coerce the railroads into wage arbitrations in which any award made is certain to be against them. It also puts new burdens on the carriers in the way of increased taxes and "safety first" equipment requirements. But the correlative duty of sanctioning additions in rates which will make good the losses thus imposed is cheerfully shifted by Congress to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The latter body has a policy of its own, feels no responsibility for the increased charges created by legislation or arbitrations, and takes only a perfunctory interest in offsetting by advanced rates the new drains on railroad revenues. Divided responsibility in control thus works all along the line to the marked disadvantage of the carriers.

There is only one way to re-establish the principle of fair play in railroad regulation. That is to centralize responsibility. If a law is passed increasing the expenses of the railroads, or an award is made by a board of arbitration under the conciliation act, it should be put directly up to the Interstate Commerce Commission to supply the additional railroad revenue needed to comply with the law or the award. New charges should be conditional on increases in rates. So long as the government regulates the railroads the latter are necessarily tied down to very moderate profits. Those profits should not be subjected to artificial disturbance through legislation or wage arbitrations.

If it had been understood at Chicago that the Interstate Commerce Commission was to adjust the railroad rates to the arbitration board's findings, Judge Pritchard would not have felt obliged to apologize in a measure for the award. The employees would have got what they deserved on the economic merits of the case and the cost of the wage advance would have been passed—as it ought always to pass—to the public using the railways.

Governmental regulation ought to work both ways. If it is decided to be in the public interest to advance the cost of railroading, the public ought to be prepared to face the situation honestly and furnish the money out of which the extra charges must be met.

A Jekyll-Hyde Nature.

Jekyll-and-Hyde natures are not confined to the political world alone, it seems. The confession of White, solid, substantial suburbanite, that he hatched a conspiracy to rob the firm which was paying him a good salary in order to obtain the funds to continue enjoyment of the night life of the Tenderloin, shows a perfect example of the dual make-up. By day he was a trusted executive, zealous for his employers' welfare; at home he was the model husband and father, enjoying the confidence of friends and neighbors; by night he was the roisterer in Manhattan's byways, foregathered with shady companions, plotting with them criminal means for gathering money for further expression of the devious and crooked side of his nature.

With this man it was more than the passive submission to crime which marks the ordinary victim of the "white light" district; it was an active, affirmative pursuit of the crook's career, apparently with the firm conviction that the orderly, law-abiding phase of his life would assure him against any possible consequences of his law-breaking. Modern life, however, is too complicated, and modern methods of detective work are too thoroughgoing to permit the double life to be safe or profit-

able for long. Prison discipline is not an unvarying cure for the warps and twists in humanity which lead to crime, but it is greatly to be hoped it can eliminate the evil from this man, whose ordinary life showed such strong traits of good.

Advertising One's Truculence.

The German submarine "blockade" of the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland must be in a bad way when its existence has to be called to the notice of the public in this country through newspaper advertisements. The warning which the German Imperial Embassy is publishing is only a paraphrase of the German Admiralty's "war zone" proclamation, which all American newspapers carried free. Why does that amazing notice to the world that German submarine commanders would be instructed to disregard all existing international law and to torpedo enemy and even neutral merchantmen on sight have to be re-advertised?

We can think of no reason for such a publicity campaign here except that the German submarines haven't lived up to the expectations of the Kaiser and of Grand Admiral von Tirpitz. They haven't shut up British and Irish ports, or even materially hampered intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland and the rest of the world. The vessels which have been torpedoed constitute less than a third of 1 per cent of the total shipping passing through the German "war zone." No big passenger steamer has yet been sunk.

The submarine captains have not hesitated to destroy ships for fear of sacrificing lives—even the lives of neutrals. They have been willing to incur classification as evildoers acting outside international law—as pirates or murderers from the point of view of those who believe that warfare should be conducted in a humane and civilized manner. But for how little, after all, have they degraded themselves?

It is one thing to be a successful and dreaded lawbreaker. It is another to be compelled to call the world's attention by newspaper advertising to your ambition to be a terror of the seas. When that is necessary most people have nearly forgotten that you ever started out to be one.

"Brutalization of Childhood."

It was not for the purpose of opening these columns to a further torrent of vague and irresponsible allegations that the president of the New York Anti-Vivisection Society was invited a few weeks ago to reduce some rhetorical flourishes she had lately indulged in to an unadorned recital of facts. "We want publicity," she had said, "trustworthy publicity," and accordingly an opportunity was offered her to make public what she knew of the abuse of physiological teaching in our public schools.

She now writes to thank The Tribune for quoting her so liberally and expresses a sincere desire "to bring this matter more fully before the readers of so important a paper." By way of justifying her allegations she tells us that "many of the high schools in New York City and vicinity, as well as the general schools throughout the state, practise vivisection"; she quotes "one young girl" who, when asked if the animals could feel, said, "They act as if they did"; she speaks, on hearsay, of "a school table full of frogs, unanesthetized and partially vivisectioned," and she offers us in conclusion the opinion of a noted anti-vivisectionist on "the brutalization of childhood." As to the evidence she was invited to give, all she has to relate is that some cruel little boys at Redwood, N. Y., "had made it a practice to go out to the woods and ponds near by, securing turtles, frogs, etc., bringing them into town, building a fire and roasting them alive." We are asked to believe that these young fiends acquired this habit "in consequence of the teaching of vivisection in the public schools"; because "our lecturer" was told so "by some merchants of that place."

If the president of the Anti-Vivisection Society has no better foundation for her denunciations she would do wisely to confine herself, as hitherto, to rhetoric.

Liquor Legislation in England.

It is easy to account for Mr. Lloyd George's determination "to take a pledge never again to touch drink—politically." When first he dropped a hint of national prohibition he was overwhelmed with letters from all parts of the kingdom. We were not told how many of them were in favor of restrictive legislation and how many against it, but what has happened in the meantime makes it clear enough that compulsion, even of a partial kind, would have proved singularly unpopular.

The belief that the King's message might make the way easy was founded on a misapprehension. Doubtless his example was followed by many, but it is one thing to imitate the voluntary action of a monarch and quite another to submit to the coercion of a legislature. When the late King ceased to use the last button of his waistcoat he set a fashion; we may be very sure, however, that not all the tailors in England could have forced that fashion by act of Parliament. Popular clamor would have driven them to Tooley Street. It is just so in the case of national temperance.

But there is more than this in the opposition to anti-alcohol legislation. The liquor industry is of vast importance; exceeding anything the Chancellor of the Exchequer seems to have dreamt of when he projected his new scheme of taxation, though he might reasonably have been expected to foresee the objections of the Irish members. Mr. William O'Brien, speaking for Cork, declared with some warmth that even the moderate measure actually proposed would be "as horrible as if the city were bombarded and sacked by Germans." Nor was Mr. Redmond slow to discover in the increased taxes one more conspiracy to strangle a great Irish industry. The upshot of the debate was a division—the first that has been taken in Parliament since the war began—and

now even the most zealous supporters of the Government are clearly convinced that there must be some modification of the new tariff.

The belief of "The Daily Chronicle" Parliamentary correspondent that a plea for total prohibition "would have excited enthusiasm in the House and country" is at least open to question. The remedy actually proposed was received coldly in to understate the case. The obvious fact is that it has failed to satisfy any party.

No "Private" Taxicabs.

The Appellate Division's decision that the Mason-Seaman Transportation Company cannot suspend by injunction the operations of the taxicab ordinance ought to put an end to the cab companies' fight. They were beaten in the courts when they contested the lower rates. Then some of them sought to get around those decisions by maintaining "private garages" and operating taxicabs "on call."

To meet that circumlocution the ordinance was amended so as to apply specifically to this "private garage" system. Thereupon the Mason-Seaman Company, making one fight for all concerns so affected, sought to obtain an injunction against the Mayor, the Police Commissioner and the Bureau of Licenses to prevent the enforcement of the amended ordinance.

What this latest decision means is that a taxicab is a public hack and must be operated at the low rates specified in the ordinance, whether it comes from a "private garage" or a public stand. It must have a license, a duly examined chauffeur and a taximeter certified by the Bureau of Licenses. In other words, when a passenger hires a taxicab he may know that whatever protection the city is able to afford to him will be his, without inquiry to ascertain whether the conveyance is acknowledged to be a public hack or is called a "private" vehicle.

The "private garage" scheme was merely a means to gouge a good portion of the cab-using public out of more than the legal rates. It is a good thing that the court has ended it.

Seranton school teachers who are about to affiliate with the labor unions in order to obtain salary increases might communicate with the school teachers here, who have been able to obtain many without other organization than their own.

Will the Interstate Commerce Commission's decision that a son-in-law is not a "member of the family" bar the "family" from interference with the younger generation?

Married "Dead Fish" with \$10,000 a Year—Houdini.

Nobody with \$10,000 a year is quite a "dead one."

However Nerolike Mr. Barnes may have been, he was never a political "fiddler." He was always "sawing wood."

That policeman who quelled the spasms of a Bronx girl by his piano playing must be a legitimate successor of Orpheus.

The Chamberlain Orchids.

From The Manchester Guardian.

The sale of the famous orchid collection from Highbury to-day was a melancholy reminder of old Ireland. No flowers in the world have been more celebrated in caricature and gossip than the orchids in "Joe's" button-hole. The hard and glossy expansiveness of the orchids seemed subtly characteristic of the phase of their famous wearer. Now the seven hundred plants on which he spent so much money and care are under the hammer, and no one is showing very much interest in them. Even the experts who gathered in Messrs. Prothero's rooms in Chesham—a place so secluded and rustic that you could fancy yourself in a country town—were not greatly excited. It was curious to hear that Mr. Chamberlain was out of date in anything, but there were hints that orchid-growing has progressed since it was his hobby. Orchids that were wonderful and precious in their tortured beauty when he acquired them are things of every day now. One remembered the awe-struck anecdotes in the great Chamberlain days describing the ransacking of South America for rare plants. Few of the well-known amateurs took the trouble to come to the sale. The bidders, by the way, were in their coats almost the only orchids to be seen in the room. The plants on the tables were not in blossom, and there was an inspiring spread of leaves labelled with enormous names. The auctioneer did not think it necessary to make a speech, and the attitude of the sleek auction-room cut suggested that he had seen livelier days. Even the orchids bearing the name of the great man were sold without much bidding—including Dendrobium Phalenopsis Chamberlaini, a splendid plant of a rare species, which only fetched about thirty shillings, but things looked up a bit when twelve guineas was given for the almost extinct variety Odontoglossum Inseayi Splendens.

Making Alcohol Distasteful.

From The Manchester Guardian.

A remarkably interesting development in the drink question in Russia is reported to-day by the publication of a document from the Russian government offering good prizes for processes that will make alcohol impossible as a drink and widen its possibilities in commerce and industry. Probably the first object is to find a use for the alcohol which is released by the vodka decree, but the conditions laid down for a prize-winning process to make liquid alcohol distasteful are so stringent that it is obviously a determined temperance as well as a commercial enterprise. So far as one can gather, no successful effort has been made to treat alcohol in this way, and though methylated spirits is alcohol with the addition of methyl, resulting in a disagreeable taste—to say the least—it is by no means impossible. It does not possess properties that make alcohol so nauseating as Russia would have it be, and it is frequently taken as a drink. There are many patent medicines for the cure of alcoholism, but I do not believe any of them consist of a treatment of alcohol itself. They either take the form of drugs administered separately as a medicine, or of tablets dissolved in tea or coffee. There is a benevolent association in London, under the chairmanship of Cecil M. Chapman, which works a patent treatment with considerable success. It entails a twenty-four days "cure," with abstinence from alcohol during that time, and it is claimed that it overcomes the craving for strong drink.

DREADNOUGHTS.



ON SEEING BOTH SIDES

Philosophizings About Party Politics and Vice and Virtue.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In this morning's issue of your very learned and instructive paper I notice a gentleman, by name George W. Wagner, is suffering from pent-up feelings of sorrow regarding your defence, or at least supposed defence, of Democratic administration. Let us try to ease him, as it certainly is one of the instincts of the human heart to relieve another's sorrow. He asks, "Who is responsible for the high tax rate?" and without the least attempt at proof positively asserts that the administrations of Dix, Sulzer and Glynn were to blame. The first axiom of logic, "What is freely asserted is freely denied," may be applied here, and if he knows what "petitio principii" is, he might apply it to his proof. Governor Whitman has been of great service in showing up the shortcomings of Glynn's administration, he asserts. Is that the only positive good he has done? There never was a man in any office whatever who did not try to belittle the efforts of his predecessor.

George Wagner, enrolled Republican, says: "There never was a more honest man in the Governor's chair than Whitman." Why, one might expect that, because "Pares cum paribus facillime congregantur" ("Birds of a feather flock together"). I might inform Mr. Wagner that it is the essence of human nature to err. "Humankind set errare," said one of the ancient philosophers, and I have yet to see a man to disprove this axiom. Vice dominates virtue. Again, I ask: Should The Tribune, a fine, broad principled paper, stick up for any one party, irrespective of the feelings of its readers? The duty of a paper is to give the public facts. It cannot try to hide the faults of any one party and praise its virtues. It must give the public both sides of the question. If the Republican party is wrong, the public ought to know, and vice versa.

Mr. Wagner, you ought to awake. Read both sides. See what the Democratic party has to say, because you will never know a question thoroughly unless you have the two sides and cons. JNO. LEO, Grant City, Staten Island, April 29, 1915.

Nurses, Servants and Suffrage.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The remark of Henry W. Hayden, in an anti-suffrage speech about government by nursemaids and house servants, is a very good demonstration of the kind of people who now do govern us. Not even a nursemaid or a house servant is so stupid as to imagine that they represent all women, any more than that tramps, drunkards, gamblers, swindlers, grafters and murderers represent all men.

Even a nursemaid or a house servant has better sense than to regard the mere physical difference between the male and the female as the essential qualification to vote.

Even nursemaids and house servants have a better sense of justice than to assume that one-half of the governed has the moral right to prevent the other half from having a voice in the government of all.

Even nursemaids and house servants may be honest and not controlled by grafting men, politicians, as many men now are.

Even nursemaids and house servants have intelligent enough in their city, state and country to want to vote.

Even nursemaids and house servants and scrubwomen are not so unreasonable as to ask all women prohibited from voting in order to afford themselves an excuse to evade their duty as citizens in a government by the people.

GEORGE M. BEEROWER, New York, April 28, 1915.

Wants Central Park Concerts.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I ask the space in your valuable paper for this letter of protest against the Board of Aldermen, who have not appropriated any money for the Central Park concerts.

Is this source of recreation from the toil and moil of every day going to be taken away from the public? Is this artistic spark of our city going to be extinguished this summer? Heaven knows how very little the people can squeeze out of the city

government in the way of recreation. Of course, there is one excuse for the board, and that is their using this money to feed the unemployed. Are they going to do that? If not, then they have no excuse for depriving the public of their concert.

GEORGE SCHEFFTEL, New York, April 29, 1915.

A Query for Scoffers.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am not a member of the Christian Science Church, but, as F. P. A. might say, "I know what I like," and I certainly don't like to see The Tribune give such prominence to letters like the one in to-day's issue about Christian Science by Captain W. H. Matthews. The gentleman said he had been dead for many years and went to Christian Science for aid.

He told the healer—who, he admitted, was a pleasant, intelligent lady—that he did not believe in Christian Science, and yet he was discouraged that he was not healed in twelve treatments at a total cost of \$12. It would be interesting to know how much the gentleman has paid the doctors for relief. Incidentally, he also says the healer, finding he was not relieved, offered and did give him further treatment free. Do our doctors do the same?

And, incidentally, because Captain Matthews, who had absolutely no faith in it from the start and now apparently delights in ridiculing it, did not get relief does not mean that Christian Science is at fault, in our humble opinion.

It has always appeared to me that the scoffers at Christian Science had better turn their talents to explaining why it is that "incurable" patients in many instances turn to Christian Science and are healed of diseases like cancer, tuberculosis, locomotor ataxia and other ailments. A READER, New York, April 27, 1915.

Faith vs. Medical Treatment.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A few days ago an item appeared in your paper which stated that because a resident of Yonkers who was a Christian Scientist had died without medical treatment, the coroner was making an investigation. On the same day the newspapers of New York, Yonkers and other places in the state contained in the aggregate hundreds of notices of deaths under licensed medical treatment; but up to the present I have not heard that the coroners have taken steps to investigate any of these cases.

Doubtless your readers will see the inconsistency of a system which penalizes trust in God but promotes and protects trust in medical methods, no matter what the physical or moral effect of medical treatment or advice may be. Christian Science—which is the reinstatement of the Christianity of Jesus—is only proving itself to be the most efficacious healing system known to mankind. Compared to material methods, the failures of Christian Science treatment are significantly few. ROBERT J. ROSS, Christian Science Committee on Publication, New York, New York, April 29, 1915.

A Sailor's Fighting Song.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In to-day's Tribune you propound the following question: Who was it who said that one Englishman could whip six Frenchmen? Now, you kindly publish an old song of which the following is a part: "It oftentimes has been told That the British seamen bold Could dog the Frenchmen two to one so handi-oh."

But they never found their match Till the Yankee boys did them catch. Oh, the Yankee boys for fighting are the dan-di-oh! DANIEL SHEVLIN, New York, April 28, 1915.

True and Upright Advertising.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: We note your comment in recent issue, headed "Fake Legislation," and appreciate your endeavor to see that a law against fraudulent advertising methods is passed in this state which contains no loopholes that can defeat the purpose. Advertisements should be just, fair, true and upright, and no one should be permitted under any device to advertise differently.

ABRAHAM ERLANGER, President of the B. V. D. Company, New York, April 27, 1915.

"A GOOD BILL TO VETO"

The Merits of Vaccination Proved by the Records.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: And now comes the Tallett-Jones bill, exempting towns of less than 50,000 from compulsory vaccination. Why should the child of ignorance and prejudice not be protected because of the size of the place?

Smallpox is smallpox everywhere, loathsome, disfiguring and deadly. How wonderful that we have vaccination to save ourselves and our own! The Tallett-Jones bill seems to presume a higher intelligence in the small towns than the large, and that voluntary vaccination will be so general that the few not desiring it will be protected by the immunity of all the others.

Let us hope that Governor Whitman, with his power of veto, is familiar with all the facts. The argument of contamination of the blood of any human being by vaccination must indeed halt on investigation of the methods employed in making the virus by the Board of Health.

At Otisville the calves are kept and inoculated. Before the inoculation with the "seed" virus the calf is carefully watched and tested by capable veterinarians. The planting of the "seed" is done in an operating room under antiseptic conditions as thorough as in any clinic. As to this "seed" inoculated. It comes either from another calf, and is proved by absolutely reliable bacterial tests to be surgically clean. Cowpox protects man against smallpox, as proved by Hoccus.

If human virus was used to inoculate a calf, think of what would be done to eliminate any possible contamination or contagion. Outside of the care used in the selection of the little child whose virus is taken, these are the precautions: The human virus is planted first on a calf, then this "seed" is planted on four rabbits, then gathered from them and replanted on another calf.

When the so-called "pulp" is gathered from the abdomen of the calf it is placed in a mixture of glycerine, water and 1 per cent carbolic acid and allowed to stand for about four weeks, so that any germs that might be present, in spite of absolutely antiseptic precautions, will be killed. But they don't stop there. Cultures are made on different media and animals are inoculated, so that they know it is clean. After its efficiency is determined it is sealed in tiny glass tubes. These retain their activity for only about three months, provided they are kept in a cool, dark place. One calf furnishes enough virus to vaccinate five hundred persons, according to Dr. Park.

One should remember that revaccination is just as important as vaccination. A vaccination only protects the individual for from seven to ten years. A child should be vaccinated before it is eight months old. What compulsory vaccination does can be realized by the Swedish statistics taken from Jürgensen. First vaccination done in 1801. By 1810 it was generally employed, and in 1816 it was made compulsory. These are the results: 1774-1801 (pre-vaccinal period)—Deaths from smallpox per million inhabitants, 2,050. 1801-1810 (transitional period), 680. 1810-1855 (enforced vaccination), 169. Pre-vaccinal period, death rate per thousand, 30. Vaccinal period, death rate per thousand, 0.17. New York, April 28, 1915.

Stinkpots in War.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The latest German excuse for the latest German atrocity (promulgated, as usual, by the Fatherland's official justifiers and subserviently echoed by the hyphenated anomalies in this country) states that the Prussians invented the noxious smell method of attack, and that the Allies would have used it if they had known of it. Unfortunately for the credibility of these assertions, the fact is that this mode of fighting was invented and perfected by the puerilest fetidus, or common polecat, several hundred thousand years ago, and no civilized people has ever chosen to infringe on his patent. LAWTON MACKALL, New York, April 29, 1915.

THE JITNEY 'BUS.

Its Failure as a Competitor with the Trolley Car.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Nowhere in the history of transportation can there be found anything comparable to the recent mushroom growth of the "jitney 'bus." Even the name has been coined of hand and is still indefinite in scope. It is applied indiscriminately either to auto "taxis" or to itinerant automobiles carrying passengers for a 5-cent fare, although the latter application is becoming the most common one. The expression "jitney" is said to have originated in the South, where it is used as a term for a 5-cent piece. Later it became popularized through its introduction into the picturesque slang of the side show barker.

Six months ago the jitney 'bus was hardly known outside of its place of origin, Los Angeles. To-day the name is likened by some alarmists to the death knell of the electric railway industry, and it must be admitted that it may temporarily do a great deal of damage if it is permitted to continue along the reckless lines of its beginning.

Of course, the fact that the automobile is inherently a more expensive means of conveyance than the electric car insures the ultimate end of any competition between the two, but the opportunity for the unregulated autobus to compete with the railway only on those streets whose highly profitable short haul traffic pays the expense of operating unprofitable suburban lines may involve losses that are really serious. The problems of increased accidents and traffic congestion are also serious, and since the wave of jitney 'buses has swept over the country one vital fact has become apparent. This is, that regulation by law can be said should be applied.

From the standpoint of the street railway operator the justification for this regulation is found in the broad fact that the street railway submits to really serious burdens for the public benefit. The jitney ignores them. This is perhaps best explained by quoting from a recent statement by the American Electric Railway Association, as follows:

"Communities are apt to forget the benefits which are received from electric railway operation and which are not received from 'jitney' bus operation. Included in these are the payment of a very large amount in taxes and in other public charges, extensive contributions toward the cost of paving, the maintenance of unprofitable lines necessary to civic development, the maintenance of fixed routes and fixed schedules and service uninterrupted so far as possible by weather conditions, the investment of a large sum of money in the equipment necessary to take care of the demands during the time of extraordinary travel, the provision of comfortable and safe cars, properly lighted and suited to the varying conditions of the seasons, the system of transfers, whereby the revenues of the company are largely reduced, in order that transportation may be furnished to all parts of the city, its financial responsibility for the damages resulting from the accidents, its submission to, the control of the regulatory bodies as to capitalization, rates and service, and, above all, the fact that a very heavy percentage of its income is returned to the community in the shape of taxes, public charges, wages, payment for supplies and other items."

"Every obligation placed upon the electric railway has been so placed by the representatives of the people in the interest of the people. It is for the public to decide whether the jitney, being a common carrier, should not assume the obligations of a common carrier."

If this were done the jitney would soon disappear, because statistics from cities where the jitney movement has been most prominent show that even a hard rain will drive them from the street.

Naturally, the total loss of earnings to the street railway industry is indeterminate until such a time as definite statistics can be obtained from the traction companies in every city in the country. In general, however, the receipts of each jitney 'bus seem to be about six dollars a day, although gross earnings as high as twelve dollars have been reported in some cases. Practically all of the receipts are withdrawn directly from the street railway earnings, as the jitney 'bus can operate only by keeping its seats filled, and therefore has to stick to routes where heavy travel has been built up by the street railway. In fact, there is only one record on record where the jitneys have tried to develop travel along new routes, this being the case in Toledo, where the three-cent streetcar fare keeps the jitney away from the railway lines.

The cost of operating a jitney is dependent upon the mileage which the 'bus makes, but as this has been found to average approximately 100 miles a day, the cost of operation may be said to range between \$3 and \$4 per day. This figure includes only current repairs, tires and gasoline and oil. The invisible expense involved on account of interest on the investment, depreciation on the car, insurance, overhead charges, incidentals and the like amounts to about 30 per cent more, so that the real cost of operation is between \$4 and \$5.50 per day. This means a sum of money ranging from \$60 cents per day to pay the wages for the driver and the profits for the owner of the car. Of course, in many cases it is less.

The explanation of the movement can be summed up in a few words. The extraordinary decrease in cost of the automobile has put it within the reach of a large class of people who are absolutely unfamiliar with business problems and who cannot grasp the principle of overhead charges, depreciation and similar invisible costs. By neglecting these the jitney operator deceives himself into thinking that the business is profitable; but after a few months of operation, when the invisible charges begin to take tangible form, he drops out, only to be replaced by some one with less experience. This has been shown clearly in most of the cities where the jitneys have been running six months or long enough to wear themselves out.

It remains now only to consider the proper place of the automobile 'bus as a transportation agent. It undoubtedly has a field, but it is not as a competitor of the electric railway car. Where the conditions of operation are entirely equal (and they are bound to be made approximately equal to all common carriers) the jitney 'bus has absolutely no chance of competing with the trolley car. It can, however, be used to advantage under the following circumstances:

1.—As a feeder at the end of electric railway lines for short distances, where another fare can be charged and where trolley rights cannot be obtained.

2.—For interurban runs, where the annual traffic is not sufficient to warrant the introduction of a trolley line. Here the small investment in the 'bus and its mobility are especially advantageous. For instance, the 'bus can be used on lines having a large traffic in summer but little or no traffic in winter, because at the end of the summer season it can be transferred to some line where it can be used during the winter.

3.—For lines "de luxe" or 10-cent-fare lines on streets where trolley lines are not permitted, as on Fifth Avenue.

A. E. CLIFFORD, New York, April 28, 1915.